



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B9

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

FILE: [REDACTED]
EAC 99 117 53494

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: OCT 3 2000

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

Public Copy

APPLICATION: Petition for Special Immigrant Battered Spouse Pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Identifying info removed to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Terrance M. O'Reilly, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of Hungary who is seeking classification as a special immigrant pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), as the battered spouse of a United States citizen.

The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that she is a person whose deportation (removal) would result in extreme hardship to herself. The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petition was denied wrongfully. He states that he is sending a brief and/or additional evidence within 30 days. However, it has been approximately four months since the filing of the appeal in this matter, and neither a brief nor additional evidence has been received in the record of proceeding.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1) states, in pertinent part, that:

(i) A spouse may file a self-petition under section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) or 204(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act for his or her classification as an immigrant relative or as a preference immigrant if he or she:

(A) Is the spouse of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States;

(B) Is eligible for immigrant classification under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) or 203(a)(2)(A) of the Act based on that relationship;

(C) Is residing in the United States;

(D) Has resided in the United States with the citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse;

(E) Has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; or is the parent of a child who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage;

(F) Is a person of good moral character;

(G) Is a person whose deportation (removal) would result in extreme hardship to himself, herself, or his or her child; and

(H) Entered into the marriage to the citizen or lawful permanent resident in good faith.

The petition, Form I-360, shows that the petitioner arrived in the United States on November 2, 1998 as the fiancée (K-1) of a United States citizen. The petitioner married her United States citizen spouse on November 12, 1998 at Honolulu, Hawaii. On March 8, 1999, a self-petition was filed by the petitioner claiming eligibility as a special immigrant alien who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, her U.S. citizen spouse during their marriage.

8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(G) requires the petitioner to establish that her removal would result in extreme hardship to herself or to her child. 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(viii) provides:

The Service will consider all credible evidence of extreme hardship submitted with a self-petition, including evidence of hardship arising from circumstances surrounding the abuse. The extreme hardship claim will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after a review of the evidence in the case. Self-petitioners are encouraged to cite and document all applicable factors, since there is no guarantee that a particular reason or reasons will result in a finding that deportation (removal) would cause extreme hardship. Hardship to persons other than the self-petitioner or the self-petitioner's child cannot be considered in determining whether a self-petitioning spouse's deportation (removal) would cause extreme hardship.

The director, in his decision, reviewed and discussed all the evidence furnished by the petitioner, including evidence furnished in response to his notice of intent to deny dated October 6, 1999. That discussion need not be repeated here. The director noted, however, that: (1) although the petitioner states that she fears her husband will follow her to Hungary and that she would not be protected from him, the record does not establish that the petitioner's husband would follow her to Hungary; (2) while the petitioner states that the unemployment rate is high and she would not easily find a job, it is not a foregone conclusion that she would not find employment upon returning home; (3) the petitioner speaks very little English and her residence in the United States is of short duration (less than two years); and (4) it is assumed that she has family and friends in Hungary who can help her.

Because the petitioner failed to establish that her removal would result in extreme hardship to herself, the director denied the petition. While counsel, on appeal, asserts that the petition was wrongfully denied, the record reflects that after reviewing the record of proceeding, the director determined that the petitioner submitted insufficient evidence to establish eligibility under 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(G).

The petitioner has failed to overcome the director's finding pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(G).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.